

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.S.DIAS

TUESDAY, THE 29TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 2022 / 8TH AGRAHAYANA, 1944

OP(C) NO. 2944 OF 2012

OS 156/2012 OF MUNSIFF COURT, ETTUMANOOR

PETITIONER/S:

- 1 THE MAHATMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY
PRIYADARSINI HILLS P.O. - 686 560, ATHIRAMPUZHA
KOTTAYAM, REPRESENTED BY ITS REGISTRAR.
- 2 THE CONTROLLER OF EXAMINATIONS
THE MAHATMA GANDHI UNIVERSITY, PRIYADARSINI HILLS P.O.
- 686 560, ATHIRAMPUZHA, KOTTAYAM,
BY ADVS.
SRI.P.JACOB VARGHESE (SR.)
SRI.ASOK M. CHERIAN, SC, M.G. UNIVERSITY

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 JOSEPH DOMINIQUE
AGED 25 YEARS
RESIDING AT KOOVAKKUNEL HOUSE, CHUNKAPPARA P.O.
KOTTANGAL VILLAGE, MALLAPPALLY TALUK, PATHANAMATHITTA
DISTRICT-686 547.
- 2 BLESSEN M. CHERIAN S/O.CHERIAN
AGED 25 YEARS
RESIDING AT MULLAPPALLIL HOUSE, NOOROMMAVU P.O.
PUNNAVELI KARA, ANIKKADU VILLAGE, MALLAPPALLY TALUK
PATHANAMATHITTA DISTRICT - 689 589.
- 3 SUNITHA S.
AGED 25 YEARS
SUDHEESH BHAVAN, KALLUKADU, VADAVATHOOR P.O.
VIJAYAPURAM VILLAGE, KOTTAYAM DISTRICT-686 010.
- 4 RESMI JANARDANAN NAIR
AGED 25 YEARS
D/O.JANARDANAN NAIR, KANNANKARA HOUSE, NADUVILEKARA
UMAYANALLOOR PO, MAYYANADU VILLAGE, KOLLAM TALUK KOLLAM
DISTRICT- 691 589.

- 5 NETTY MOL P.T. D/O.THANKACHAN P.J.
AGED 25 YEARS
PANICHERIYIL HOUSE, ERUMBAYAM PO, VELLOOR VILLAGE
VAIKOM TALUK, KOTTAYAM DISTRICT - 691 589.
- 6 VIJESH RAJAN SO.V.N. RAJAN
AGED 25 YEARS
RESIDING AT VAIKUNTAM HOUSE, MULANTHURUTHY P.O.
KANAYANNUR TALUK, ERNAKULAM DISTRICT- 686 605.
- 7 DENNIS GEORGE S/O.GEORGE JACOB
AGED 25 YEARS
RESIDING AT KONATTEL HOUSE, KALATHOOR P.O.-686 633
KAINAKARI VILLAGE, MEENACHIL TALUK, KOTTAYAM DISTRICT.
- 8 THE PRINCIPAL BCM COLLEGE
KOTTAYAM VILLAGE, KOTTAYAM TALUK, KOTTAYAM DISTRICT 686
631.
- 9 JAISON JOSEPH
ADVOCATE COMMISSIONER, ADVOCATE, BAR ASSOCIATION
ETTUMANOOR, KOTTAYAM DISTRICT-686 631.
FOR R8 BY ADVS.
SRI.BABY ISSAC ILLICKAL
SRI.ISAAC KURUVILLA ILLIKAL

THIS OP (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR HEARING ON 29.11.2022, THE
COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

JUDGMENT

The original petition is filed challenging an order passed by the Court of the Munsiff, Ettumanoor, directing an Advocate Commissioner to inspect the 1st petitioner University.

2. Today, when the original petition was taken up for consideration, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the suit was filed by the respondents 1 to 7 for a permanent prohibitory injunction, to restrain the petitioners and the 8th respondent from doing any act against the statutes or from conducting re-examination for respondents 1 to 7. It is submitted that the respondents 1 to 7 have passed their respective courses from the 1st petitioner University, and therefore, nothing survives in the original petition.

In the result, without prejudice to the right of the parties to challenge any subsequent orders/judgment

passed in the suit, the original petition is dismissed as infructuous.

Sd/-

C.S.DIAS, JUDGE

okb/29.11.22

//True copy// P.S. to Judge